



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,423	03/12/2004	David Ray Burritt	403118-A-01-US (Burritt)	7122
47523 7590 09/21/2007 JOHN C. MORAN, ATTORNEY, P.C. 4120 EAST 115 PLACE THORNTON, CO 80233-2623			EXAMINER WOODS, ERIC V	
			ART UNIT 2628	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/799,423	Applicant(s) BURRITT ET AL.	
	Examiner Eric Woods	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14, 16-28, 37 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14, 16-28, 37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/20/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see claim amendments and Remarks pages 14-28, filed 6/20/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2-14 and 16-28 under various statutes have been fully considered and are persuasive.

In view of applicant's amendments to the claims, the rejection of claims 16-28 under 35 USC §101 stands withdrawn.

In view of applicant's amendments to the claims, the rejection of claims 2-14 and 16-28 under 35 USC §103 stands withdrawn.

As requested by applicant on page 15 (Remarks, 6/20/2007), Examiner will clarify with respect to the issue of the priority date of the claimed invention that may have not been sufficiently clear in the Final Action. Examiner was making the point that when a combination of elements is presented in a claim in a CIP, the *claim as a whole receives the filing date (EFD) of the most recently added subject matter*. See MPEP 2133.01, "Rejection of Continuation-In-Part (CIP) Applications":

Art Unit: 2628

When applicant files a continuation-in-part whose claims are not supported by the parent application, the effective filing date is the filing date of the child CIP. Any prior art disclosing the invention or an obvious variant thereof having a critical reference date more than 1 year prior to the filing date of the child will bar the issuance of a patent under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). *Paperless Accounting v. Bay Area Rapid Transit System*, 804 F.2d 659, 665, 231 USPQ 649, 653 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The statement of applicant in Remarks dated 1/23/2007 on page 20:

Priority

The present application is a Continuation-In-Part application. The Examiner is correct that the parent priority documents do not disclose "emphasizing the status information using visual enhancement". However, the parent priority documents do disclose detailed operations which are utilized in the present application for obtaining the telecommunication terminal status information and for presenting the emphasized status information.

Therefore, under proper examination procedure and judicial precedent – as well as applicants' previous admissions in the record – the critical date **for the claimed invention as a whole is the date of filing of the child CIP**, regardless of the critical date of various portions of the claimed invention.

Since all grounds of rejection have been withdrawn, applicant's arguments are therefore moot; examiner does not reach them given that the amendments to the claims resulted in withdrawal of current grounds of rejection.

With respect to the presented issue of providing said service or displaying said emphasized data "to a user having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing," examiner submits that such a limitation is an intended use, rendering the issue of

Art Unit: 2628

whether or not the preamble receives patentable weight moot (since the language therein has been added to the body of the claim).

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of various references as set forth below.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/23/2007 was filed after the filing of the RCE on 6/20/2007. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2628

Claims 2-6 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stogel (US PGPub 2002/0159574 A1) in view of Schnarel et al (US 6,975,712 B1)('Schnarel') and Smith et al (US PGPub 2003/0214519)('Smith').

As to claims 2 and 16,

Stogel teaches the following limitations:

A method for providing telecommunication terminal status information to people having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing, comprising the steps of:

-Receiving telecommunication terminal status information by a telecommunication terminal via a network; (Stogel Figure 1, telephones 133/135 receive status information via a network, where it is understood that connection 187 constitutes a VoIP or similar class of voice-over-internet protocol [0018,0028-0029]. For purposes of analysis of the Stogel reference, the fully digital, packetized data architecture for voice {e.g. VoIP} is utilized, where this is clearly one implementation of Stogel [0018,0029,etc]. The data therefore is sent to the devices from the NID (network interface device [0033], e.g. cable /DSL modem and the like), where it is clear that this includes all CPE (customer premises equipment [0033]). Specifically, the "loop interface 113" connects the ATDA 100 [0027], located at customer premises, where the connection is via or at least through / transits a LAN [0021], where it is clear that a fully digital, packetized voice network is contemplated, since the connection from block 131 to block 151 specifies that block 151 provides access to remote data networks [0042]. The specified device 100 in Figure 1 is integral with (e.g. part of) a telephone (e.g. 133,

Art Unit: 2628

135) [0038]. Therefore, devices 133 and 135 are "telecommunications terminals."

Under the operating assumption above, all the devices (133, 135, 137, 141, 145) are connected on the same LAN behind NID 131 (e.g. DSL modem [0040,0029]). It is well known in the art that such devices have output ports for Ethernet / LAN (IEEE 802.3*) connections, which can therefore be connected to a LAN utilizing a multiport Ethernet hub, switch, router, and/or gateway. Indeed, such devices (DSL modems) can have integral routers / switch / hub for Ethernet, and existed prior to the critical date of the instant application.)

-Establishing direct communication with the telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal; (Stogel teaches that device 100 (part of telephone 133, 135) is connected to LAN 139, which in turn is linked to computer 141[0036-0037]. That is, controller 101, which is part of device 100, sends the data to other devices on the network. Specifically, computer 141 has the information transmitted to them [0047], where such device clearly has a separate monitor / display device. Such networks operate on TCP/IP, which require open connections through a port, which constitute "direct communication." Inherently, all devices connected on the same LAN ("the network"), are on the same network. This setup was the normal setup for customer networks at and before the critical date of the instant application. Finally, and most importantly, the system provides that server 141 "MAY BE USED TO CONTROL AND SUPERVISE OPERATION OF A ATDA 100." [0036] Therefore, it is logical that server

141 can directly access the status information contained in device 100 integral with telecommunications terminals 133, 135.)

-Directly accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunication terminal by the computer via the network; (See Stogel above; the information is transmitted via LAN 139 to computer 141 and caller ID display 137, where such information is therefore shown. Specifically, [0047] teaches "in the case of server 141, controller 110 (*part of device 100, integral with telecommunications terminals 133, 135*) transmits an appropriate data message via LAN interface 119 to LAN 139 for display at server 141." (See also [0036])[As noted above, the analysis here uses the fully packetized convergent digital network model; that is, that the architecture utilizes VoIP, which therefore means that the packetized digital voice data is transmitted over the same IP network as all other components behind NID 131.] Therefore, since the telecommunications terminals 135, 133 have the aforementioned LAN connection, clearly the data transmitted over LAN 139 is "directly connected", which, as noted above, means that there are no intermediary gateways between the nodes on the same LAN, e.g. same IP sub-network. Further, it is specified in [0048] that the controller 101 in ATDA 100 which is integral with devices 133, 135, collects status information such as off-hook information, escape sequences, and other types of DTMF information. Also, [0021] states, "[A] lines status detector may be included and used to determine whether the subscriber line is available (e.g. idle, all telephones "onhook" for initiating a call to the remote database" Further, [0035] "[the] Display for ATDA may further be used to provide status indicators, prompts, and other information to the user..."). The specific

Art Unit: 2628

logical extension here is that since server 141 can supervise and control operation of ATDA 100 and the status information is shown on the telecommunications terminal 133, 135 and that the CID information and the like is transmitted to the server, that if server 141 is controlling ATDA 100 that the status information that is available to that device must logically be transmitted to and accessible for the device that is supervising / controlling ATDA 100.)

-Displaying the visual telecommunication terminal status information on the visual display to a user. (Stogel clearly teaches that on-hook [0014,0021,0028,0048] and off-hook status determination is part of the device 100's role (that is, the role is filled by various components of ATDA device 100 that is integral with telecommunication terminals 133, 135. This information, including additional DTMF data, time / date stamp [0054-0056], etc, is shown to the user on the plural display devices, *inclusive of server 141*, as specified above in 0047, since the information is sent "for display." As specified in detail above, server 141 contains a visual display as clearly indicated in the drawing in Figure 1 and by virtue of the fact that server 141 is described to display such information. Specifically, "To the extent that caller ID name information is not available and name or other information is stored in database 115, this information may be displayed locally on display 117 and transmitted for display to remote devices such as caller ID display 137 or server 141. Thus, in the case of server 141, Controller 110 transmits an appropriate data message

Art Unit: 2628

via LAN interface 119 to LAN 139 for display at server

141."[0047]) That is, the reference makes expressly that server 141 [0046] receives transmission of such information for display, and that 141 controls 100 integral with 133,135.

Stogel fails to expressly teach, but Schnarel teaches:

-Emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information using visual enhancement;

-Displaying *enhanced ... information* (Schnarel clearly displays enhanced visual information for connected calls and status information – see Figure 1 as call slip 100 in extended form that sits on top of the display (5:10-20), and Figure 5, where such enhanced or enlarged text is discussed as shown as extended call slip 500 / 504 in Figure (5:65-6:10), where such information is enhanced during a call, as well as icons concerning the status and the like, 7:35-8:40 and the like, especially including 11:45-60 – this is the most relevant portion. Clearly, the specific display of Schnarel performs the operations on the data after it has been received from the telecommunications terminal, and the text is in a much larger size. Schnarel clearly contemplates that other information concerning line status and the like can be shown therein – 2:20-60.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stogel in light of Schnarel to have the enhanced

Art Unit: 2628

information display in light of Schnarel 2:30-50 – that is, it is beneficial to have a state-aware information device that presents important, relevant information in a manner that is easier to visually perceive – in this case, larger.

Examiner contends that this combination inherently performs the recited functionality; that is, any user who has such impairment will see the recited information in an enlarged size because this is the fundamental method of operation of the Schnarel reference. Examiner further contends that this limitation of a specific user group constitutes an intended use. Based on initial research, this particular situation appears to be one of first impression. In order to further prosecution in this case, the Smith reference is applied.

Stogel and Schnarel fail to expressly teach, but Smith teaches:

Displaying enhanced...information to a user having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing. (Smith, Abstract, [0003-0005]. Large numbers of persons have vision impairment of some kind. In this case, it is beneficial to displace enlarged text and information in order for it to be easier to read [0006-0008, Abstract]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the device of Stogel and Schnarel for users having poor vision (e.g. significant vision impairment) in the manner set forth by and for the reasons set forth in the Smith reference [0002-0008]; that is, such a user will significantly benefit from such a device that presents the modified, enhanced information.

As to claims 3 and 17, Stogel does not expressly teach these limitations, but Schnarel teaches them – see Tables 1 and 2 on column sets (7/8) and (9/10) respectively with an ALERT/FULL state shown, where these are clearly alerts as defined in the specification. Motivation and rationale are incorporated by reference from the rejection to the parent claim(s).

As to claims 4 and 18, Stogel does not teach this limitation where Schnarel teaches expanded call slips, which is cited above and found in 4:50-60, 6:25-45, 11:50-60, where the text is clearly larger. However, Schnarel does not expressly address the situation of users with low visual acuity but emphasizes that showing alert information in a larger format, but does not expressly disclose using a larger font or the like, whereas Smith has such teaching, which, in addition to motivation and rationale, is incorporated by reference from the rejection of the parent claim(s).

As to claims 5 and 19, Stogel does not teach but Schnarel clearly teaches the enlarged text on the expanded call slip of Schnarel (see Figure 1), which constitutes 'different' visual form. In addition, Smith teaches (Abstract) that such form changes can constitute modifying the color, size, and/or font of the textual information. Motivation and rationale is incorporated by reference from the rejection of the parent claim(s).

Art Unit: 2628

As to claims 6 and 20, Stogel fails to teach but Schnarel teaches (4:50-60, 6:25-45, 11:50-60) using 'large unique portion of display' (e.g. call slip), whilst both of the above fail to teach but Smith teaches the recited enhanced ('highly visible') {fonts, color} (Abstract), which are additionally well known in the art {see MPEP 2143.03(C) for requirements for requests for evidence and traversal}.

Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Stogel, Schnarel, and Smith (hereafter 'SSS') as applied to claims 8 and 22 above, and further in view of Becker et al (US 6,192,341 B1).

As to claims 7 and 21, whilst SSS do not expressly teach this limitation, Becker clearly discloses that Becker generates such audio information in 7:35-55, and 3:35-55, and the like. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify JSS in view of Becker, which teaches several methods of visual enhancement by doing so and that such is beneficial for at least visually impaired users (7:12-35), so such a combination would have been obvious to a PHOSITA at the time the invention was made for those reasons.

Claims 8-11, 13-14, 22-25, and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson, Jr. et al (US 6,661,779 B2)('Johnson') in view of Schnarel et al (US 6,975,712 B1)('Schnarel') and Smith et al (US PGPub 2003/0214519)('Smith')

As to claims 8 and 22,

Art Unit: 2628

A method for providing telecommunication terminal status information to people having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing, comprising the steps of:

-Establishing direct communication with a telecommunication switching system controlling a telecommunications terminal by a computer controlling a visual display where the computer is a separate unit from the telecommunication terminal; (Johnson clearly teaches a system in Figure 1 having a switch 34 connected to PCs {18, 22, 26} personal computer, having a monitor/display) via IP/packet data network 30 through switch interface 33 which is a direct connection between the switch and PC {18, 22, 26}, where such interface may be integral with the switch itself. The 'telecommunication terminal' constitutes telephone device {20, 24, 28}. For purposes of this discussion, the station 14, specifically PC 26 and telephone 28, obtains connection status for telecommunication terminals from aforementioned switch in the manner described above. (2:8-55). As noted therein, the telephone and PC are separate 2:10-50)

-Directly accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from the telecommunication switching system by the computer via a path distinct from that used to transmit the telecommunication terminal status information to the telecommunication terminal; (The switch provides status information in CPDU (conference protocol data unit) form, which includes *telephone connection status information, such as ringing, off-hook, on-hook busy, etc for all conference participants.*

Art Unit: 2628

Clearly IP packet data network 30 is a separate path than the telephone network 32.

Such accessing in CPDU format, etc, has been discussed above. 2:22-58)

-Displaying the visual telecommunication terminal status information on the visual display to a user. (4:40-65 teaches of showing status information to user, where status information includes the above (2:22-58))

Johnson fails to expressly teach, but Schnarel teaches:

-Emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information using visual enhancement;

-Displaying *enhanced ... information* (Schnarel clearly displays enhanced visual information for connected calls and status information – see Figure 1 as call slip 100 in extended form that sits on top of the display (5:10-20), and Figure 5, where such enhanced or enlarged text is discussed as shown as extended call slip 500 / 504 in Figure (5:65-6:10), where such information is enhanced during a call, as well as icons concerning the status and the like, 7:35-8:40 and the like, especially including 11:45-60 – this is the most relevant portion. Clearly, the specific display of Schnarel performs the operations on the data after it has been received from the telecommunications terminal, and the text is in a much larger size. Schnarel clearly contemplates that other information concerning line status and the like can be shown therein – 2:20-60.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson in light of Schnarel to have the enhanced information display in light of Schnarel 2:30-50 – that is, it is beneficial to have a state-aware information device that presents important, relevant information in a manner that is easier to visually perceive – in this case, larger.

Examiner contends that this combination inherently performs the recited functionality; that is, any user who has such impairment will see the recited information in an enlarged size because this is the fundamental method of operation of the Schnarel reference. Examiner further contends that this limitation of a specific user group constitutes an intended use. Based on initial research, this particular situation appears to be one of first impression. In order to further prosecution in this case, the Smith reference is applied.

Johnson and Schnarel fail to expressly teach, but Smith teaches:

Displaying enhanced...information to a user having at least one of poor visual acuity and poor hearing. (Smith, Abstract, [0003-0005]. Large numbers of persons have vision impairment of some kind. In this case, it is beneficial to displace enlarged text and information in order for it to be easier to read [0006-0008, Abstract]).

As to claims 9 and 23, Johnson does not teach this limitation where Schnarel teaches expanded call slips, which is cited above and found in 4:50-60, 6:25-45, 11:50-

Art Unit: 2628

60, where the text is clearly larger. However, Schnarel does not expressly address the situation of users with low visual acuity but emphasizes that showing alert information in a larger format, but does not expressly disclose using a larger font or the like, whereas Smith has such teaching, which, in addition to motivation and rationale, is incorporated by reference from the rejection of the parent claim(s).

As to claims 10 and 24, Johnson does not teach but Schnarel clearly teaches the enlarged text on the expanded call slip of Schnarel (see Figure 1), which constitutes 'different' visual form. In addition, Smith teaches (Abstract) that such form changes can constitute modifying the color, size, and/or font of the textual information. Motivation and rationale is incorporated by reference from the rejection of the parent claim(s).

As to claims 11 and 25, Johnson fails to teach but Schnarel teaches (4:50-60, 6:25-45, 11:50-60) using 'large unique portion of display' (e.g. call slip), whilst both of the above fail to teach but Smith teaches the recited enhanced ('highly visible') {fonts, color} (Abstract), which are additionally well known in the art {see MPEP 2143.03(C) for requirements for requests for evidence and traversal}. Motivation and rationale is incorporated by reference from the rejection of the parent claim(s).

As to claims 13 and 27,

Art Unit: 2628

Johnson teaches that (2:8-25) the connection between the **switch interface 33/switch 34 and PC 26 using IP packet data network 30 (Internet, alternate data path)** is performed **via a TCP/IP network** that inherently utilizes **sockets**. It is inherent in the functioning of TCP/IP stack that sockets are used, e.g. connection is described as socket by <IP address>: <Port Number> and includes the following information: protocol being used (TCP, UDP, raw IP), local IP address, local port, remote IP address, and remote port. See RFC 147 for further definition of *socket* as used with respect to TCP.

As to claims 14 and 28,

Johnson teaches the use of TCP/IP. Clearly, an open bidirectional IP socket provides for connectivity between **PC 26 and switch interface 33 / switch 34**. Therefore, any information request by Conference Meister 14 to switch 34 will result in information being 'read' over the connection. Since the Conference Meister requests such information, clearly such information being obtained via the request constitutes 'reading.'

Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson, Schnarel, and Smith (hereafter 'JSS') as applied to claims 8 and 22 above, and further in view of Becker et al (US 6,192,341 B1).

As to claims 12 and 26, whilst JSS do not expressly teach this limitation, Becker clearly discloses that Becker generates such audio information in 7:35-55, and 3:35-55, and the like. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2628

invention was made to modify JSS in view of Becker, which teaches several methods of visual enhancement by doing so and that such is beneficial for at least visually impaired users (7:12-35), so such a combination would have been obvious to a PHOSITA at the time the invention was made for those reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Woods whose telephone number is 571-272-7775. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2628

Eric Woods

9/17/2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ulka Chauhan".

ULKA CHAUHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER